UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,342	12/09/2004	Bernd Lang	PTB-4750-23	2905
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH GI	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	HICKS, VICTORIA J		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3772	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/517,342	LANG ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		VICTORIA HICKS	3772					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence a	ddress				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPERIOR IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)[\	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/	9/04						
,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is action is non-final.						
3)	,—							
٥,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims	•	,					
· · ·		n						
•	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
•	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to: Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> are subject to restriction and/or	coloction requirement						
0)	Claim(s) 1-44 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🔲	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.						
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
2)  Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 					

Application/Control Number: 10/517,342

Art Unit: 3772

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

This action is in response to the application filed on December 9, 2004.

## Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Species I: mask pad

Species II: breathing mask

**Species III:** process for production of a mask pad

Species IV: moulding tool

A telephone call was made to Paul Bowen on 3/23/09 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does

Application/Control Number: 10/517,342 Page 3

Art Unit: 3772

not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

**Species I:** claims 1-12, 25-38

Species II: claims 13-15

Species III: claims 16-20, 39-44

Species IV: claim 21-24

The following claim(s) are generic: none.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Species I relates to mask pad, Species II relates to a breathing mask without padding, Species III relates to a process for making a mask pad and Species IV relates to a moulding tool. All of these technical features make each species unique.

## Conclusion

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/517,342 Page 5

Art Unit: 3772

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VICTORIA HICKS whose telephone number is (571)270-7033. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on (571) 272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/V. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 3772 5/1/09

/Patricia Bianco/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3772